REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **October 18, 2004**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-28. Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Talagala et al. (USPub 2002/0162076, hereinafter "Talagala").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 10, 11, and 20 were rejected as being anticipated by Talagala. Applicant respectfully points out that Talagala teaches scrubbing a storage array to determine **if a single stored checksum** matches the calculated checksum for the related data in the storage array (see Talagala, Abstract).

In contrast, the present invention **stores two checksums**, including a current checksum and an old checksum, the current checksum is related to the data that is supposed to be currently stored in the block of data and the old checksum is related to the data that was previously stored in the block of data (see page 7, lines 11-22 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it solves a problem that arises when the checksum is written separately from the data. When the checksum is written separately from the data, it is possible for the write of the data to fail, in which case the checksum will be out of synch with the data. The present invention solves this problem by writing two checksum to disk (a current checksum and an old checksum). This allows the system to determine if the data that is supposed to be stored in the block of data was actually stored there or if the old data (which matches the old checksum) is still stored there. There is nothing within Talagala, either explicit or implicit, which suggests storing two checksum values, including a current checksum related to data that is supposed to be stored in the data block and an old checksum related to data that was previously stored in the data block.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, 11, and 20 to clarify that the present invention stores two checksum values, including a current checksum and an old checksum, the current checksum being related to the data that is supposed to be currently stored in the block of data and the old checksum being related to the data that was previously stored in the block of data. These amendments find support on page 7, lines 11-22 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, 11, and 20 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-9, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-19, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 21-28, which depend upon claim 20, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: November 12, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665